

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 19-21 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the prior art and under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. With regard to the rejection of the claims over the prior art, Claims 1, 6 and 11 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0099829 (Richards, et al) in view of U.S. Patent 5,895,463 (Dowling, et al. Claims 1, 6 and 11 were also rejected as being unpatentable over Richards in view of U.S. Patent 7,054,953 (Nakajima, et al. Claims 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Richards, et al. in view Dowling and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,834,297 (Peiffer, et al.).

The rejections of the claims over the prior art are respectfully traversed. Applicants' herein ask that independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 be amended to address the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Examiner, in the Office Action, indicated that Claim 1 recites the limitation "file" in lines 15-18, that the claim refers to multiple web content files, and it is not clear which files is being referred to. Similar limitations occur in Claims 6 and 11.

Claims 1, 6 and 11, as presented herein, are being amended to address the Examiner's objections, and in particular, these claims are being amended to more clearly distinguish between references to the requested file and references to the reduced size file. For example, in lines 15, 17 and 19 of Claim 1, "the file" is being changed to "the requested file" to indicate that this file refers to the file that was requested by the client computer. Also, line 6 of Claim 1 is being

amended to indicate that the size of the requested file is reduced “to form the reduced size file,” which provides the appropriate antecedent basis for later references to “the reduced size file.”

It is noted that line 14 of Claim 1 refers to “multiple web-content files,” and this claim is being amended to indicate expressly that these multiple files includes the requested file. There are no subsequent references in the claim to “multiple file.” Also, it is believed that, as amended herein, it is clear what each occurrence of “file” refers to, and specifically, whether each occurrence refers to either the requested file or the reduced size file.

Similar changes are requested herein to Claims 6 and 11.

The amendments requested herein overcome the Examiner’s objections to independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 and to the dependent Claims 19-21. These changes to Claims 1, 6 and 11 do not raise any new issues, do not require any further searching, and, moreover, put the claims in better condition for appeal. Accordingly, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 11 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The rejection of the claims over the prior art are respectfully traversed because the prior art does not disclose or render obvious the feature of identifying logic blocks that are duplicated within multiple web content files, including the requested file, and consolidating the identified, duplicated logic blocks in the requested file into one entity in the reduced size file, as described in independent Claims 1, 6 and 11.

The instant invention, generally, provides methods and systems for reducing the size of files prior to being downloaded over computer networks. The size of the file can be reduced by removing pre-identified matter, including both renderable and non-renderable data, from the file. For example, unused logic blocks are removed and recurring identifiers are shortened. Also,

logic blocks that are duplicated within multiple WCFs, including the requested file, are optimized to reference a single function in a library. Clearly, in order to do this, the present invention takes into consideration not only the currently requested WCF that is being reduced, but also other WCFs that share logic blocks with that currently requested WCF.

As mentioned above, the prior art does not disclose or render obvious this feature of the present invention.

For example, Richards, et al, which is the primary reference relied on to reject the claims, discloses a filter proxy system for comprehensive content acceleration and automated content formatting. The disclosed system provides means and mechanisms for establishing, entering, updating and retrieving device and user profiles specification and templates in the respective database. These means and mechanisms also analyze the markup (ML) language while applying the specifications of the device and user profiles to determine what data formatting filters and/or compression filters are required. In addition, the disclosed system provides means and mechanisms for analyzing the ML language while applying the specifications of the device and user profiles to define an ML template or establish the best fit of an existing ML template to further refine the process of re-purposing, re-authoring and formatting the ML and its content for a specific device and user.

In the Office Action, the Examiner agreed that Richards, et al. does not disclose identifying logic blocks that are duplicated within multiple web-content files, and consolidating the identified duplicated logic blocks in the file into one entity in the reduced size file. However, the Examiner argued that it would have been obvious to consolidate the duplicated blocks across

multiple files, because of all the reasons found in Richards including reducing bandwidth and effectively utilizing resources between systems.

Applicants respectfully disagree because the above-discussed feature of the present invention requires looking at multiple web content files to determine what to consolidate in the currently requested file. This is not a mere extension of the ideas described in Richards, et al; and is a difference in kind, not merely a difference in degree, between the present invention and Richards, et al. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, based on the disclosure of Richards, et al, to look at other web content files to determine what to consolidate in the currently requested file.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or render obvious this feature of the instant invention.

Dowling was cited for its disclosure of shortening words to a single character. Dowling describes an electronic reference device to access all members of any one of a plurality of groups of data items. This electronic device includes a memory, and data is organized into a compressed format before being stored in this memory. In that compression process, a group of words may be selected, and each word is assigned a unique number.

Nakajima was also cited for teaching shortening words or data structures to a single character. This reference discloses a procedure for sending and receiving a data structure. In this procedure, a data structure is compressed and then transmitted. The structure is compressed in such a way that the receiver is able to reconstitute the original form of the data structure.

Peiffer, et al. discloses a procedure for accelerating data transmission over a computer network, and, in particular, filtering data from a web resource to increase the speed at which this resource can be transmitted over a network. In this procedure, a portion of an original web resource is processed to form a size-optimized web resource having a smaller file size than the original web resource, and that size-optimized web resource is sent to the remote client.

None of the above-references, however, discloses or renders obvious the feature of identifying logic blocks that are duplicated within multiple web-content files, and consolidating the identified, duplicated logic blocks in the requested file into one entity in the reduced size file.

This feature is of utility because, when a web content file is being sent to a client, the size of the file can be reduced based, not only on the content of current file being processed, but also on other files that may be, or that have been, sent to a client. As a result, in many circumstances, the file can be reduced to a greater extent than if these other files are not taken into consideration.


Independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 clearly set forth the above-discussed feature of the present invention. In particular, each of these claims describes the feature of identifying logic blocks that are duplicated within multiple web-content files, and consolidating the identified, duplicated logic blocks in the requested file into one entity in the reduced size file.

In view of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claim 19 is dependent from Claim 1 and is allowable therewith; Claim 20 is dependent from, and is allowable with Claim 6; and similarly, Claim 21 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 11. The Examiner is accordingly,

respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 6, 11 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow these Claims.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 6, 11 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and 112, and to allow these claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 7472-4343

JSS:jy